

# Relative Clauses in Ten Plays of Plautus

by Patti Sankee

*1913*

Submitted to the Department of Latin of the  
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TEN  
PLAYS OF PLAUTUS

PATTI SANKEE

1913

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TEN PLAYS OF PLAUTUS.

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Latin  
of the University of Kansas in Partial Fulfill-  
ment of the Requirements for the Degree of Mas-  
ter of Arts..

By

Patti Sankee

June, 1913.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Discussion of Grammars.....	3
Gildersleeve.....	4
Lane.....	6
Allen and Greenough.....	6
Bennett.....	8
Roby.....	9
Hale and Buck.....	10
Discussion of Syntactical Works.....	11
Holze.....	11
Draeger.....	12
Bennett.....	12
Hale's Cum-constructions.....	21
Outline of Relative Clauses.....	25
Definitions of Relative Clauses.....	26
Examples of the Characterizing Clause.....	31
Figures for the Characterizing Clause.....	44
Discussion of the Characterizing Clauses.....	45
Examples of the Causal Clauses.....	48
Figures for the Causal Clauses.....	53
Discussion of the Causal Clauses.....	51
(Non)Habet <u>quod</u> <u>det</u> , <u>Nulla</u> <u>causast</u> <u>quin</u> .....	54
Definitions.....	58
Summary.....	59



In Latin, relative clauses are found with two modes - the indicative and the subjunctive. Clauses with the indicative state ( as, He is the man who conquered Gaul) or assume a fact ( as, A man who is rich is happy). Some of the subjunctive clauses have a subjunctive which may be referred to an independent use of the mode. These are the Volative, or Purpose (*militis misit qui pontem delerent*), the Potential (*non habet quod det*) and the Obligation and Propriety (*nulla causa est quin metuas*) clauses. All admit that the first clause is a Volitive Subjunctive, but in the case of the other two, there is dispute and it will be necessary to discuss them later, though, in the main part of the paper, they will be omitted along with the Purpose clause. Another large class of clauses with the subjunctive is made up of the clauses depending upon another subjunctive or an infinitive. These clauses are often used as examples and in explanations as if there were no reason outside the clause which brings about the use of the subjunctive. This cannot safely be done because many clauses which are regularly indicative have, in such a position, the other mode. Since they prove nothing about the general trend of the indicative and subjunctive, these clauses will also be omitted in this paper.

It must not be thought that the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty, as a distinct force in independent sentences, is ignored in this classification and elimination. If it could be separated distinctly from the Subjunctive of Actuality, our problem would be much smaller than it is. In the clauses left after those mentioned above have been removed, the subjunctives of Ideal Certainty and Actuality are so intermingled that no exact line of demarcation can be drawn between them. This is true also of result clauses. Unlike result clauses, an indicative with apparently exactly the meaning of the Subjunctive of Actuality appears in some clauses. The confused condition of this residue of clauses calls forth three questions. How can this heterogeneous mass of clauses be defined? Which have the subjunctive regularly and which have both modes? Why do the clauses of fact have a subjunctive at all?

The only thing which can give any definite answer to all these questions is a complete set of examples from a definite author or part of an author. For this, I shall use Plautus, the oldest Latin extant, because there, if anywhere, can be found the reason for the subjunctive in clauses of fact. At least part of the answer to the other questions ought to be found there, though, of course, all rules for Early Latin must be modified for Classical Latin. Work has already been done

on these clauses with sets of examples from all Latin literature but such examples do not constitute a proof because they may be rare and fail to show the real trend of usage while the important examples may have been, for some reason, omitted entirely. With incomplete examples, the reader has no way of knowing whether such a thing has been done or not. Of two constructions, he cannot know which is the prevailing or more common one.

Taking our questions as they have been asked, let us consider first how the grammars attempt to define these clauses and what explanations they give, if any.

Most grammars name this group Characterizing, or divide it into Characterizing and qui-causal clauses. Other names are Descriptive and Qualitative. The objection to all these names is that they are both too inclusive and too exclusive. Many clauses which do not fall in this class and would not fit into the grammar definitions characterize or describe the antecedent. "Cato who was a good old man," characterizes Cato but does not belong in this group of clauses. Other clauses in the group, those with expressions of existence and non-existence do not describe at all. "There are people who define the characterizing clause," does not mean "people of such a sort that they attempt such a bold thing" but it does mean that "Some

people do define it". The names ordinarily given to the clause are not satisfactory but at present I am unable to devise a better one, so through this paper these clauses will be called characterizing, always with the understanding that the name does not fit or suit the clauses.

Gildersleeve (63I), however, uses a different name for these clauses. He calls them Relative Sentences of Tendency. If I understand his name, it means that all subjunctives in relative clauses of this sort are Ideal Certainty, that none of them state a fact. His examples belie this because he gives this example:- Solus es C. Caesar cum in victoria ceciderit nemo, and translates, "Thou art the only one Caesar in whose victory no one has fallen." He next says that the "potential relative clauses are put in the subjunctive when qui = ut is. Qui does, as a rule, equal ut is in clauses after tam tantus, etc. but not in all clauses after an expression of existence and non-existence. At least, if it does equal ut is, the ut is not used interchangeably with the qui. We find "nemo est qui", but never "nemo est ut."

He then divides into four categories. First, "Clauses with definite antecedents when the character is emphasized; regularly after idoneus, dignus, is, talis, tam, unus, etc." He gives no example of a definite antecedent without such a modifier. Such clauses occur but in them a qualitative work like talis is always felt to be needed. The real antecedent of the clauses

following the modifiers he mentions is not the definite grammatical antecedent but an indefinite antecedent to be supplied with the talis, unus, or other word. He gives the example, *Est innocentia adfectio talis animi quae noceat nemini*, and translates it, "Innocence is that state of mind which, etc!" This is not a good translation because talis does not mean that (*ille* or *is*) but such a, *solus* means the only one, etc. His second division takes up the clauses with indefinite antecedents after negatives and combinations of multi, quidam, etc., with est or sunt. He tries in a note to distinguish a difference in meaning between the indicative and the subjunctive after these expressions, saying that the indicative is used for a definite statement and the subjunctive for a general characteristic. He does not explain satisfactorily why the negative antecedents never have "definite statements" but always "general characteristics". His third division is the "comparative with quam as an object clause," and his fourth is the relative parallel with an adjective and joined to it by et or sed. He places the qui-causal clauses in a separate section merely saying that when qui = cum is the subjunctive is used. Now in Plautus, the qui-causal clause with the subjunctive usually, ~~in Plautus~~, gives the ground for the statement and not the reason for the action. The other qui-causal clauses are regularly indicative and all the cum-causal clauses are indicative. Gildersleeve does not



mention these causal clauses in the indicative and this leaves the impression that all causal clauses must be subjunctive.

Lane (1818) names these clauses Sentences of Characteristic or Result. He attempts no general definition of the clauses as a class. He has two divisions with these rules or definitions. First - "Relative sentences of Characteristic or Result are equivalent to subjunctive sentences introduced by ut." This statement does not state the exact usage in Plautus, at least, since there tam and kindred words are not followed by ut as well as qui. They were not interchangeable at that stage of the language though in Classical Latin they apparently were. He then devotes sub-divisions to the constructions after dignus etc, and the clauses connected with an adjective by et or sed. The second division is defined thus, "Relative sentences after assertions or questions of existence and non-existence usually take the subjunctive." He gives a list of the phrases which take this construction and says that "the indicative is not infrequently found in affirmative sentences particularly in old Latin and in poetry." In the next section he takes up the causal relative sentences saying that relative sentences like this are equivalent to subjunctive sentences introduced by cum. The objections made to a similar statement by Gildersleeve hold good here.

Allen and Greenough (534 - 35) have practically two treatments of the Characterizing Clause, as they name it. One is a discussion by Morris used as an introduction to the large section

on the clauses. Morris says that the subjunctive is a potential one which has in some cases been extended until it differs but slightly from a statement of fact. He says that the indicative in such a clause states a fact about an antecedent while the subjunctive "defines the antecedent as a person or thing of such a character that the statement made of him or it is true of all others of the same class". To show the difference between these two, he takes an example from Cicero: *Non potest exercitum is continere imperator qui se ipse non continet*. The relative clause here is exactly equivalent to a condition with si. Such clauses regularly take the indicative, yet Morris puts a subjunctive in the relative clause and says that then it is characterizing, meaning, "That commander who is of such a sort that he cannot, etc." This is a manufactured example and I fear he could not find its parallel in Latin literature.

The general definition in the main section is this -  
"A Relative Clause with the subjunctive is often used to indicate a characteristic of the antecedent especially when the antecedent is otherwise undefined." All subjunctive clauses in this group do not, as a matter of fact, characterize the antecedent, as, for instance, *Nemo extat qui ibi sex mensis vixerit*. The phrase, "especially when the antecedent is not otherwise defined" is objectionable since an antecedent when defined, as for instance a proper name, regularly has an indicative clause after it. "Cato

who was a wise old man, etc", is always indicative unless attracted or in indirect discourse. The general divisions of the clause are as follows: First, Clauses after expressions of existence and non-existence. Here a statement is made that the negative is always followed by the subjunctive while the indicative occurs sometimes with sunt qui and is more common than the subjunctive with multi, (etc) sunt qui. The second division is clauses with unus, solus, etc., the third with quam ut and quam qui; fourth, the restrictive; fifth, the subjunctive causal clause and sixth, the clause after idoneus dignus, etc. They put the causal clause in here without hinting that its antecedent is always clearly defined. Perhaps the last phrase of their general definition was meant to allow for this. They call clauses with talis, tam, etc, relative clauses of result - a construction which they, according to a note, derive from the other characterizing clauses. The same note says that no sharp line can be drawn between the two clauses because of this connection.

Bennett calls the clauses we are discussing Characterizing Clauses. Outside his first paragraph, his treatment is just like that of Allen and Greenough, excepting the statement about the varying use of modes which Bennett does not mention. I shall, therefore, confine this criticism to the introductory paragraph. Bennet says, "A relative clause used to express a quality or characteristic of a general or indefinite antecedent is called a Clause of Characteristic and usually stands in the subjunctive".

The objections to the phrase "express a quality or characteristic" have already been given. He errs most, however, in inserting the word "general". A general antecedent always has a clause which can be turned into a general condition. "No one who does wrong escapes punishment = No one, if he does wrong, escapes punishment." Such a clause is always indicative unless the form of the condition requires the subjunctive. His statement that these clauses usually take the subjunctive is incomplete and leaves the impression that all these clauses may, on occasion, have the indicative, a thing true only of the sunt qui clauses, or similar affirmative expressions.

In Roby's Grammar (1678) these clauses are called consecutive. He says they greatly resemble the final sentences except that non instead of ne is used as the negative. He then says that "the subjunctive in these sentences in no way implies the non-existence of the action but simply that the principal and sub-ordinate clauses are related as cause (real or possible) and effect." This must mean that the idea is consecutive, i.e., the nature of the antecedent is such that as a result the action or state of the subordinate clause occurs. There is no general definition of the clauses. He says that the clauses introduced by qui are adjectival and that the qui = ut is. Then there is this statement, "The construction in the subjunctive is especially frequent (a) after demonstratives or adjectives of qual-

ity (b) after assertions of existence and non-existence (c) occasionally without any such introduction. This definition is similar to Lane's and is on the whole a fairly accurate one as far as it goes. There are no statements about the varying usage of the subjunctive although he gives contrasting examples with the indicative or all the kinds of clauses. He includes quod sciam among these clauses without any explanation about why it should be there since it fits into none of his classes of clauses.

The Hale and Buck Grammar has a treatment of the Descriptive Clause, as they call it, which is entirely different from that of any of the other grammars mentioned above. In this grammar, the different forces of the subjunctive are treated separately. This requires some mention of the descriptive clauses under each heading and a consequent separation of the clause into four or five different places. Even the most important ones, Ideal Certain~~ty~~ty and Actuality, are separated and nothing is given to show that they shade into each other so that one cannot always be told from the other. This is very unfortunate because it leaves the student with the feeling that there are several entirely distinct kinds of descriptive clauses. The statements taken all together give a pretty good treatment of the



clause. It would have been very helpful if Hale had here been able to introduce his divisions of the relative clauses into essential and non-essential which is so convenient in the discussion of the indicative clauses. He does contrast them with the determinative clauses.

As for the casual and adversative clauses, he merely says that such a clause may have the subjunctive and contrasts it with the indicative saying the subjunctive is the explicit, and the indicative the tacit, casual clause.

Considering these grammars typical - as I think we may safely do - it is easily seen that no positive answer has yet been given to our first two questions. Lane, who succeeds better than any one else, gives no general definition covering all the clauses but contents himself with describing or defining the kinds of clauses usually classified under the name characterizing. No particular attempt to answer the third question has been made in the grammar.

For more light on our first questions and for an answer to the third, let us turn to the works on syntax. Since Plautus is to be used for examples the first work to consult is Holze's *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*. Its classification of clauses is so general that very little can be gained from it. Examples of all kinds of sentences with

the indicative where the subjunctive would be expected are given. The classification is according to the kind of subjunctive and not according to the kind of clause. No figures are given about the relative frequency of the two modes in different types of clauses and the examples are so scattered and confused that little can be gained from them since no count can be made using them as material.

Draeger, in his *Historische Syntax der Latienischen Sprache*, calls all these clauses consecutive and says that in sunt qui clauses even in early Latin the subjunctive is the prevailing mode. On the authority of Paetzolt (whoever he is) he makes the statement that with the negative antecedent, which always has the subjunctive, there are 24 examples. There are 38 examples of the subjunctive following sunt qui clauses. He makes no statement whatever about the indicative with these clauses. Neither of these works presents any definition or theory about origin of these clauses.

Now we come to a work which ought to give us the facts about these clauses,- Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin*. This book was, presumably, written for just such a purpose - to present the examples and statistics and let the student decide for himself what he thinks about the syntactical question under consideration. In the preface, Bennett says that his book is intended to replace the "now antiquated" Holze.

In one way it is better than Holze, the classification of the various clauses is more complete and minute than in the older work. In another way, it is worse than Holze because a full set of examples is not given. In some places merely a few examples and the number of times the construction occurs is given. In other places the examples are complete but no context is given and in many cases only the name of the play and the line where the example occurs is given.

Not only does he fail to give all the examples which he has collected and classified, but he has failed completely to give the relative clauses which contain the indicative. He classifies the temporal indicatives very minutely, by the introductory word, and all the indicative usages, in comparison, are shown but the only reference to the relative clause is in a short paragraph about the *qui*-causal with the indicative. As far as any other statements, outside the paragraph on characterizing clauses, go the relative clause with the indicative is ignored. For all that Bennett says excepting one or two statements in the characterizing clause section, the indicative might never be used in simple relative clauses introduced by *qui*. He probably thought the thing too simple to include but in the characterizing clause some comparison with the indicative must be made. Since he has made no division of the indicative clauses he is tempted to put all subjunctive relative clauses in his characterizing category,

instead of referring them to a kind of clause which is usually indicative but has, for certain reasons in certain places, the subjunctive mode. He has, Cap 27I, Proxim~~um~~ quod sit bono id volo. This does not seem to be characterizing at all but a clause which tells what its antecedent is. Such a clause is usually indicative; here the subjunctive seems to ideal certainty or volitive. Phor. Beatus, ni unum desit, animus qui istace ferat. This clause can be turned into a general condition. Such clauses are usually indicative but here the condition is of the Future less vivid type which has the subjunctive in this sort of condition just as in any other.

When we come to consider his classification of the subjunctive clauses we find several objectionable things. He names the first category of the developed characterizing clause, "Nullus qui, nemo qui, etc." Now, clauses directly following nemo or nullus or other such word can be turned into a general condition and, as has been said before, such clauses are regularly indicative. "No one who reads Bennett's book can agree with him here;" "Can be turned into" No one if he, etc.," with exactly the same meaning. However, "There is no one who reads" is a characterizing clause because it shows the verb of existence. His examples show the verb and are characterizing. The verb is present in "Quis est qui" and "Si est qui" but lacking again in "solus qui, unus qui, pauci qui, multi qui, alii qui, etc." The examples with the

subjunctive in these clauses are not very numerous but Bennett does not even throw out a hint to his unsuspecting reader that clauses of this type usually have the indicative. His statements imply that the construction is always subjunctive. This is not true because I have three examples of multi and one with alii in the indicative.

After this he has a category labeled is, ille, iste qui. All his examples under characterizing clauses are supposed to be complete. In this category he has only one example which is not is qui. This example is Stich.261 Reliqui(linguam) ecillam quae dicat . From the context this seems to be nothing but Ideal Certainty - "I left that tongue which would speak." In that case he has no example of ille and he has not even given an example with iste. One of his examples with id has already been criticized on page 14. The others can be explained as Volitives.

Hale does say that ille can have a characterizing clause but Bennett does not seem to be following Hale; he is merely giving a general name to a particular kind of clause.

Next follows a large section devoted to "the clauses which follow indefinite antecedents which refer to persons or things. "Does he mean by this particular persons or things ? Surely, all their indefinite antecedents are per-



sons or things of one sort or another. He gives the number of clauses of this kind as 34 and <sup>he</sup> either gives or refers to 17 of them. Three of these are sunt qui with the subjunctive, est ubi praestet, Cap.327; adfatimest hominum qui singulas edint, Men.456 ; non desunt mihi qui dent, Afran. 62 . Yet on the next page he says, "Sunt qui in Early Latin is regularly followed by the indicative." Since he gives no sunt qui and, as a matter of fact, no other qui-clauses with the indicative we cannot be sure what proportion means "regularly " to Bennett. Several of his clauses in this category do not seem to me to be characterizing. One of them Cas.I94, ancillulan postulat quae mea est quae meo educta sumptu siet, seems, when the context is examined, to be causal not characterizing. Bennett's book does not print enough of the context to show this, but I have tried to give enough to substantiate my claim. Another Amp. 824, mihi adsunt testes qui illud quod dicam adsentiant seems to be either Ideal Certainty or Volitive ("witnesses who would" or "witnesses to show") . Another must be a mistake of some sort; while Bennett's example reads Pseud. 392, exquire unum qui certus siet, Lindsay's text which, he says in the preface, he used, has est. Poen. I4I7, dabo quae placeat is either a clause which can be turned into a general condition of the second type or a Volitive Subjunctive. There are other clauses which seem

doubtful to me and yet only half of his number are given at all.

The qui-causal clauses which he puts in here are divided according to the person of the verb. In all these categories I am forced to confess suspicions about the completeness of the examples. With examples from two plays, seven omissions were found in the characterizing clauses. These examples may be in some other place but they really belong right here among the characterizing clauses.

Bennett in his three works on syntax, The Appendix of the Grammar, Latin Language and Syntax of Early Latin presents the following theory about the origin of the so-called characterizing clauses. The subjunctive got its start in relative clauses of Ideal Certainty containing verbs like malim, velim, etc. Since in these verbs the feeling of contingency is so slight they easily pass over into statements of fact. Only in his latest work does he say, in so many words, that after the clause with these verbs was established, other verbs came in. In the other books, it is merely implied. In the second work, Latin Language, he says that the change to a statement of fact took place after negative expressions but he does not explain such a change and he gives no credit, even in the preface, to Hale from whom he probably received

this idea. In the other two works he says nothing about the negative. In the Syntax of Early Latin, he refers to Hale's Cum-constructions in a foot-note and even misuses one of Hale's definitions in his introductory paragraphs on the characterizing clause, but he does not use the essential part of Hale's explanation - the negative antecedents.

Bennett, it seems to me, fails to explain, satisfactorily, why the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty spread in clauses after expressions of existence and non-existence and did not spread in clauses like "This is the thing which I should like," making it mean, "This is the thing which I do like," -- a kind of clause which is always indicative. I have one example of a sentence like this with velim where the subjunctive is surely Ideal Certainty. Why did such a subjunctive have more influence in a clause with an expression of existence and non-existence than it had in clauses like that given above?

Bennett gives no reason. Moreover, if the characterizing clauses started in this way would not these verbs, for instance the most common one, volo, be invariably or almost invariably subjunctive? At least they ought to be subjunctive very often in order to bring analogy into play for the rest of the verbs. If these particular verbs were alone the cause of the subjunctive would not the affirmative and negative antecedents show the same usage? My collection shows one example of velim

with a negative expression of existence and one with si quis est qui. The affirmative expressions of existence show sunt qui with one subjunctive and two indicatives, quidam est qui with two indicatives and multi sunt qui with three indicatives of volo. Out of seven cases of volo in the affirmative one is subjunctive and three out of nine in all expressions of existence and non-existence are subjunctive. The same proportions hold in other relative clauses. There are twenty-two instances of volo in the indicative where attraction could not work and four where it remains indicative in spite of the opportunity of attraction. Against these twenty-six examples of the indicative ~~are~~ eleven cases of the subjunctive, ten where attraction might account for the subjunctive and one where the subjunctive is Ideal Certainty outside the reach of attraction. Surely, the subjunctive of volo was not a very active force in the relative clauses in Plautus. The other verbs he mentions are fewer in number and nothing can be drawn from them. The causal subjunctives were not counted in the above figures. They show no instance of volo and only one possum. It seems hardly possible that these few verbs in Ideal Certainty were the only start for the characterizing clause. It really seems that some of the verbs in Bennett's "etc" have their influence, too.

In the Appendix and the Latin Language, Bennett attempts

to justify his apparent mistake in placing the qui - causal clause, whose antecedent is always definite, in a set of clauses defined as having an indefinite antecedent. He says that the sentence, *O fortunate adulescens qui tuae virtutis Homerum prae conem inveneris*, the word "one" is to be supplied after the word "you" to be the indefinite antecedent of the clause. He says, "The person of the verb is a species of attraction." If this explanation is right there ought to be examples or traces of such a word inserted after the definite antecedent to serve as an indefinite antecedent of a characterizing clause. If there are such clauses, Bennett ought to show them. If the person of the verb is attracted he ought to show instances of other constructions where this occurs. I think we may very well use the argument which he uses against Morris in another place, "that the theory is not supported by other phenomena of the language."

In his *Syntax of Early Latin*, he does not give this explanation. Here he says that the notion of cause is accessory and developed purely as a result of the context: *Sanus tu non es qui furem me voces* is literally, "You the sort of person who. He does not give his earlier explanation but this translation seems to imply it. In this book, he says that the subjunctive qui-causal clauses in Early Latin usually



give, not the reason for the action, but the ground for the statement and a few indicatives in this construction are found. In this I am glad to be able to agree with Bennett. It is true as far as my examples go, as is also his statement about the first and second persons being more common than the third. This last fact is not important and hardly interesting. It is due probably to the fact that the plays are, for the most part, the conversation of people who discuss their own actions more than those of outsiders.

It must be evident from this rather detailed discussion that Bennett is not wholly satisfactory or complete in his explanations of the characterizing clauses. Another attempt to explain these clauses has been made by Hale in his Cum-constructions. This is his explanation as well as I can understand it; to me, at least, it is confusing in some points. It may be well to add that he follows a method just the opposite of that of the other people we have discussed. He begins, in his Cum-constructions, with all the relative clauses and by a process of elimination reaches the characterizing or descriptive clause.

In his explanation, Hale seems to confuse two things. He calls these clauses consecutive and explains that the change from the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty to the subjunctive expressing a fact arose from a confusion between what

was said and what was implied. He adds that this confusion was especially aided by the negative clauses. If the subjunctive in these clauses is always consecutive, as he seems to say in some places, then the explanation about the negative is useless because in the result clauses the subjunctive changed from Ideal Certainty to Actuality without the help of the negative, and it ought to do the same thing in these clauses. The other explanation, which he seems to try to blend with this one, is that the subjunctive in these clauses started as a Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty, "There are people who would". Now, in a negative expression like this no line can be drawn between the meaning of "There is no one who would" and "There is no one who does". Because of this confusion, the subjunctive became invariable after negative clauses and from this spread into affirmative sentences which stated a fact and were not Ideal Certainty. This last explanation accounts for the condition of the negative and affirmative clauses better than the first one does.

Hale seems to try to blend these two explanations and only succeeds in confusing the reader. Nowhere does he give a definition of exactly what he means by the word "consecutive".

A little later on he says "where the consecutive force is clear" and means in clauses with balis, tam, etc. In the next clause he mentions nullus est qui and says nothing about it being consecutive. Yet on the next page, he says that he "assumes that the feeling which leads to the invariable use of the subjunctive after nullus est qui is consecutive." He uses this last assertion as a basis for his explanation of the qui-causal. The qui-causal clause started in a consecutive sentence like, *Insanus es qui me Tyndarum appeles*, where the verb is one of Ideal Certainty.. This not only gives the result of the adjective in the main clause but also the reason for the application of the adjective - in that it is causal. This causal feeling grew and became so well established that verbs of activity as well as sum and an adjective were used in the principal clause. Thus the subjunctive causal clause was developed. It is not a characterizing clause but a descendent of the same original force that the characterizing clause had, i.e., Ideal Certainty..

Hale's statement about the usage in the characterizing and causal clauses is as follows. The subjunctive is always used in qui-clauses expressing the result of an adjective modified by tam, etc; it is the established mode when the consecutive idea is clear. It is always used in clauses

after phrases like nullus est qui; with quis est qui and si quis est qui it is not fixed since Terence has an instance of the indicative; and after phrases like sunt qui the indicative is still in Early Latin the commoner mode. The causal clause, he says, is, in the type insanus es qui much more commonly subjunctive whereas the other causal qui-clauses are usually indicative.

## RELATIVE CLAUSES CLASSIFIED.

### I.- Non-essential

1.- Forward moving

2.- Parenthetical

(a) Free descriptive

(aa) Causal (both ind. and subj.)

### II.- Essential

1.- Determinative

(a) Preliminary Presentation

2.- Generalizing

3.- Characterizing

(a) Ideal Certainty and Actuality

(aa) Consecutive

(bb) Expressions of existence and non-existence.

(b) Potential

(c) Volitive

(d) Obligation and Propriety

- NOTES.- 1. There may be some causal clauses which are not descriptive; they are all parenthetical.
2. The relative purpose clause is probably Non-essential although there may be cases where it is Essential.

These definitions and explanations are typical, and they all go to show that any attempt to deal with these clauses alone is confusing and even useless. At least, no results have been attained by those who follow this method. As I have said before, Hale's method is the opposite of this. He begins with all the clauses and, by a process of elimination, reaches the group in question. Hale's explanation seemed to fit the facts better than the others and I have adopted it in attempting to answer the questions about these clauses. I adopted his classification of clauses, provisionally, and collected all the relative clauses in six plays of Plautus. For the characterizing and causal, I collected from four more plays. On the whole, the classification fitted very well.

These are, in my own words, the definitions adapted from Hale's Cum-constructions ( see preceding page for outline ) and used to determine the place of the clauses to be classified. Figures for clauses introduced by qui will be given with all except the last which will be discussed at length.

Relative clauses may be divided into two groups - Essential and Non-Essential. An Essential clause is one which is necessary to complete its antecedent; without it, the antecedent is not understood. A Non-essential clause is one that follows a complete antecedent, as, for instance, a proper



name. It is not a matter of the completeness or incompleteness of the thought without the subordinate clause but the completeness or incompleteness of the antecedent of the clause. In a clause like this, "Cato, who hated Carthage, wanted it destroyed", every one will agree that the clause is Non-essential because it follows a proper name, which is always complete in itself, yet it is necessary to the sense of the statement. In a clause like this, "Give me that slave I left with you", the words "that slave" are left hanging or incomplete without the relative clause. Of course, many clauses are Essential or Non-essential according to the interpretation, which is determined by the tone of the voice, a gesture, or the presence or absence of the person or thing to which reference is made.

Taking the Non-essential clauses first, they group themselves into two general classes. One kind of clause advances the story just as a correlative clause or a new sentence would do. This is a Forward-moving clause and numbers twenty-nine in six plays. The other class is the clauses which are inserted in the sentence to tell something of interest by the way. These may be called Parenthetical clauses and there are altogether 247 indicatives and 16 subjunctives. Some of the Parenthetical clauses describe their antecedent in stating a fact about it. There are 183 indicatives and 13 subjunctives. Hale

calls them Free Descriptive. Some of these Free Descriptive clauses are causal also. These constitute 82 indicatives and 13 subjunctives from among the Free Descriptive clauses. Of the 13 subjunctives, 3 are purely causal and the others can be accounted for by attraction or indirect discourse. These subjunctive causal clauses will be referred to again. These figures go to show that the Non-essential clauses are regularly indicative.

The Essential clauses fall into two well-marked groups and a residue which is made up of so many elements that it cannot be very well defined. One of the well-marked groups tells what its antecedent is by stating some fact presumably known to the reader. We may call this a Determinative clause -Hale's name. This has 272 examples of the indicative and 25 of the subjunctive. 45 of the indicative clauses are what Hale calls Preliminary Neutral Presentation. In this the relative clause is placed first and its real relation to the rest of the sentence is not apparent until the sentence is finished, -("What you want that you will get"). This kind of a clause is distinguished only because some of them would, in other positions, have a subjunctive and be characterizing but, placed as they are at the first in a non-committal way, they are always in the indicative. The 25 subjunctives in this clause are six Ideal

Certainty, 18 attracted or in indirect discourse and 1 Volitive. These figures go to show that the Determinative regularly has the indicative.

The other well-marked Essential group is the clause which follows a general antecedent and can be turned into a general condition without changing the meaning. The name Generalizing is convenient for this clause. Of it, there are 103 indicatives and 27 subjunctives. 20 of the 27 subjunctives can be accounted for by attraction<sup>or</sup> indirect discourse and 4 are subjunctive because of the form of the condition. 3 of them are the subjunctive of the Indefinite Second Person, - a form from which no conclusions can be drawn since it is always subjunctive. The Generalizing clause also, from these figures, seems to be regularly indicative.

We have now eliminated the clauses which are regularly indicative. In the following discussion, the relative clause of purpose and clauses attracted into the subjunctive or in indirect discourse are omitted and the clauses containing a subjunctive of obligation and propriety or a potential subjunctive will be left until the last. Leaving out all the above-mentioned clauses we reach the group of relative clauses which we started out to investigate, about which we asked three questions.

How can these clauses be defined ? Which have the subjunctive regularly and which have both modes ? Why do the clauses of fact have a subjunctive at all ?

We have seen that the grammars fail to give a general definition for these clauses; the grammar which gives the best treatment does not even attempt a single definition which covers all the clauses but describes the different kinds of clauses which are found. The grammars and works on syntax disagree about the use of the modes. Some say nothing about the difference in usage after negative and after affirmative main clauses. Some say the indicative is regular with "sunt qui" clauses while Draeger says the subjunctive is already the prevailing mode in Plautus. The only attempts at explanation are those of Bennette and Hale. In Bennett's work, the explanation is not the principal thing. The book is supposed to give complete examples and the theories advanced are secondary to this. I think that I have already shown that Bennett's theories about these clauses are not convincing. On the other hand, Hale's is an honest attempt to give a thorough-going explanation of these constructions. He gives examples from all periods of the literature but does not give complete examples or figures for any one period, author, or part of an author. For this reason, one cannot be sure that his examples are representative or even common constructions in the language.

To supply the necessary figures for a limited part of Latin literature is, in large part, the aim of this paper. From these it can be discovered whether the Hale theory, which on the face of it seems probable, is really an acceptable one.

The examples are from these plays of Plautus, Ritschel's edition.

- I.- Amphitryon
- 2.- Aulularia
- 3.- Captivi
- 4.- Casina
- 5.- Cistellaria
- 6.- Menaechmi
- 7.- Miles Gloriosus
- 8.- Mostellaria
- 9.- Stichus
- 10.- Trinummus

The Captivi and the Trinummus were read twice, the others once. The clauses were divided into the following categories.

- I.- Consecutive - Tam, talis---qui; is(such)---qui.
- II.-Existence and Non-existence - nullus(nemo) est qui; si quis est qui; quis est qui; sunt(est)qui; multi sunt qui; pauci sunt qui; habeo aliquem qui; alii sunt qui; reperire aliquem qui;
- Miscellaneous.

III.- Causal - Insanus es qui; indicative resembling this.

IV.- Other clauses sometimes classed with the pure characterizing - nil habet quod det; nulla causast quin; quod sciam.

First the clauses with tam, talis, etc.

- 1.- Numquam erit tam avarus quin te manud emittat gratiis, Cap.408.
- 2.- An ille tam esset stultus qui mihi mille nummum crederet Philippum, Trin, 954.
- 3.- Qui homo culpam admisit in se nullus est tam parvi preti quin puriget se, Aul. 79I.
- 4.- Nam hospes nullus tam in inimici hospitium devorti potest quin iam odiosus siet, M.G. 742.
- 5.- Nec quisquam nunc tam audax fuit qui obviam obsistat mihi, Am.985.
- 6.- Tantillum loculi ubi catellus cubet id mihi sat erit loci. Stich. 620.
- 7.- Neque profectost tanta audacia qui aequae faciat confidenter, M.G. 465

In all these clauses except 4 the tam modifies an adjective. In 4, it modifies the verb apparently.

Hale says that with tam---qui, the subjunctive is always used. He says, however, nothing about the frequency of the construction and the fact that he places it first of all in his account of the usage in Plautus leaves the impression that such clauses are frequent. A comparison with, say the negative clauses, shows that it is not nearly so frequent. A comparison with the result clauses shows that tam---ut does not occur and tantus---ut only once. There is one case of tam---ut in Terence, if Bennett may be trusted here. This shows the



beginning of an invasion of the ut into the province of the qui, which caused it to be a common construction in Classical Latin. Talis according to Lane is rare. It does not occur in these clauses in the ten plays read. Bennett does not give it with ut and his arrangement, for the relative clauses, is such that one cannot tell whether it is ever used or not. Very plainly qui does not equal ut is in Plautus.

The category is(such)---qui does not yield any examples of the pure characterizing clause with such a phrase. These clauses show an is which has a qualitative meaning although the subjunctive here seems to be volitive.

- 1.- Eos requirunt qui reddant domi, Cap. 473 .
- 2.- Eum videto ut capias qui credat mihi, Most. 558.
- 3.- Dummodo eam des quae sit quaestuosa, M.G. 786.

Hale thus far seems to be right in saying that is meaning "such" is not found with a characterizing clause in Early Latin. The clauses above, however, show the start of such a clause and these result clauses show a further development.

- 1.- Et eum morbum mi esse ut qui opus sit insputarier?  
Cap. 553
- 2.- Postquam ea adolevit ad eam aetatulam ut viris placere posset, Cas. 46

These are the only examples of such a construction which I have found thus far, but there are several in Terence.

This shows the growth of the qualitative is which is so common in classical times. The characterizing clause must have developed out of the ut construction which has already made its appearance.

In ten plays there are, then, seven examples of the clauses which Hale, in one place, calls the "clearly consecutive". Opposed to these, are a much larger number of clauses with expressions of existence and non-existence. Let us take these up beginning with those acknowledged by all to be invariably subjunctive - the clauses with a negative antecedent. The clauses after nullus est qui and those expressions equivalent to it follow.

- 1.- Neque exitium neque spes quae hunc mi metum aspellat, Cap. 519.
- 2.- Nec est mihi quisquam aequè melius quod velim, Cap. 700.
- 3.- In morte nil est quod metum mali, Cap. 741.
- 4.- Nec quicquamst quodius illic ager fuit quin pessume ei res vorterit, Trin. 534.
- 5.- Nemo exstat qui ibi sex menses vixerit, Trin. 543.
- 6.- Tacere numquam quicquamst quod queat, Trin 801.
- 7.- Neque esse hominem arbitror quod fides fidelitasque amicum erga aequiperet, Trin. 1125.
- 8-9.- Natus nemo servat neque qui recludat neque qui prodeat, Most. 452.
- 10-11.- Homo nullust te sceletior qui vivat neque quod ego amplius male plus libens faxim, Aul. 420.

I2.- Curiosus nemost quin sit malevolens, Stich. 288.

I3.- Neque ullast confidentia iam in corde quim amiserim  
Am. I059.

I4.- Nec apud te fuit quicquam qui mihi placeret, Cist. I8

I5-I6-I7.- Nec quemquam fideliozem neque quoi plus credat  
potes mittere ad eum nec qui magis sit servos ex  
sententia, neque adeo quoi tuom concedat filium  
audacius, Cap. 347ff

I8.- Nisi tuos unus filius quem ego amem alius nemost,  
Cist, 370.

In The following clause the subjunctive may be due to the connection with other descriptive words by nec. It is from the Caterva of the Captivi and it cannot be used as evidence because the Caterva was written in the time of the Empire. Nec pueri suppositio nec argenti circumdatio neque ubi amans adulescens scortum liberet, Cap. I03I

Only two of these I8 examples show quin as an introductory word while three out of seven of the Consecutive clauses have quin.

Next in natural order come two clauses in which the subjunctive is almost invariable - si quis est qui, and quis est qui ? These expressions are not, in themselves, negative there is, according to Hale, and I believe it is true, a negative always implied in the context. There is one example with the indicative in Terence which shows that the clause was not invariably subjunctive yet. The fact that these clauses are

next to take the subjunctive regularly seems to show that the negative has some influence in the use of the subjunctive. It must have helped the nullus est qui bring in the subjunctive in affirmative clauses.

Si quis est qui.

- 1.- Do tibi operam si quid est quod velis, Cap. 618.
- 2.- Si quid tibi placeat quod illi congestum siet, Trin. 472.
- 3.- Si quid erit quod illi placeat, Most. 773.
- 4.- Si quicquamst aliud quod credam, Am. 271.
- 5.- Si quidemst quod doleat, Cist. 67.

Quis est qui.

- 1.- Quid est quod tu me nunc optuere, furcifer? Most. 69
- 2.- Ecquid homost qui facere argenti cupiat aliquantum? Most. 354.
- 3.- Num quis est sermonem nostrum qui aucupet? Most. 473
- 4.- Ecquis his est maxumam his qui iniuriam foribus defendat? Most. 899.
- 5.- Quis me Athenis nunc magis quicquamst homo quod di sint propitii, Aul. 810.
- 6.- Quid est cererum quod morae sit tibi ? As. 750.
- 7-8-9.- Numquis hic prope adest qui rem alienam potius curet quam suam, qui aucupet me quid agam, qui de vesperi vivat suo ? M.G. 994.
- 10.- Sed quis est qui homo munus velit fungier pro me ? Cas. 951.

This finishes the clauses which have a negative expressed or implied. They number 35 in all. Let us next consider those in which the antecedent is affirmative. These clauses include sunt qui, multi sunt qui, pauci sunt qui, alii sunt qui, habeo aliquem qui, and quidam sunt qui. These clauses will be divided into two sets, those with the indicative and with the subjunctive.

### Sunt qui.

#### Indicative.

- 1.- Nam sunt quae ego ex te solo scitari volo, Cap. 263.
- 2.- Est profecto deus, qui quae nos gerimus audit, Cap. 313.
- 3.- Sunt quos scio esse amicos, Trin. 91.
- 4.- Sunt quos suspicor, Trin. 91.
- 5.- Sunt quorum ingenia nequeo noscere, Trin. 92.
- 6.- Sunt res quas propter tibi suscensui, Trin. 1164.
- 7.- Paucis Euclio est quod te volo de communi re appellare, Aul. 199.
- 8.- Magna est res quam ego otiose cupio loqui, Aul. 771.
- 9.- Mihi sola est quod superfit, M.G. 356.
- 10.- Sunt qui volunt te conventam, Cist. 704.
- 11.- Sunt qui hic inter se quos nunc credo dicere, Cas. 67.
- 12.- Est quod volo exquirere ex te, Cas. 689.

## Subjunctive

- 1.- Est etiam ubi profecto praestet, Cap. 327.
- 2.- Adfatimst homini in dies qui singulas escas edint, Men. 457.
- 3.- Sunt tamen quos miseros maleque habeas, Trin. 269.
- 4.- Mihi quoque adsunt testes qui illud quod ego dicam adsentiant, Am. 824 (possibly purpose).
- 5.- Domi est foris aegre quod siet satis semper est, Cas. 176.

Of 17 sunt qui clauses, 5 are subjunctive. This seems to bear out Hale's statement that the indicative is more common. Does it bear out Bennett's statement that it is "regularly used"? 64 % of the clauses are indicative, but it does not seem to me that that is enough to warrant the use of the word "regularly".

None of the other expressions of existence are as numerous as the sunt qui clauses.

## Multi qui.

### Indicative.

- 1.- Ne opproba, multa eveniunt homini quae volt, Trin. 361.
- 2.- Multa eveniunt homini quae ne volt, Trin. 361.
- 3.- Eo non multa quae ne volt eveniunt, Trin. 364.

### Subjunctive.

- 1.- Sescenta sunt quae memorem si sit otium, Aul. 320 (Ideal Certainty).
- 2.- Nec qua in plura sint mihi quae velim, Cas. 370.



Pauci sunt qui shows one example.

I.- Pauci sint qui faxim qui sciant quod nesciunt, Trin. 221.

No conclusions can be based on this since the feeling of the volitive sint runs over into the sciant. Attraction could not account for this because nesciunt is not attracted.

In quidam sunt qui, the antecedent is almost definite, usually entirely definite in the speaker's mind. The indicative is, therefore, to be expected. Hale calls the subjunctive in clauses like this "a returning eddy in the onward flow of the development of the subjunctive construction".

Quidam sunt qui.

I.- Adulescens quidam est qui in hisce habitat aedibus,  
Trin. 12

2.- Res quaedamst quam volo abs te exorare, Trin. 324.

3.- Consulere quiddamst quod tecum volo, Most. II 02.

4.- Est quidam homo qui illam sit se scire ubi sit.  
Cist. 735.

5.- Est ei quidam servos, qui in morbo, cubat, Cas. 37.

6.- Quidamst qui scit quod quaeris, M.G. I 012.

The next two categories, unlike the preceding ones, have more subjunctives than indicatives. In these, the antecedent is much more indefinite than antecedents like multi, quidam, etc. They are Alii sunt qui and habeo aliquem qui.

Alii sunt qui

Indicative

1.-Sunt alii qui te volturium vocant, Trin. 101.

Subjunctive

1.-Aliud est quod potius fabulenur, M.G. 877.

2.- Ecquis alius Sosia intuet qui mei similis siet,  
Am. 856

3.- Aliorum adfatimst qui faciant, Cist. 281.

With habeo aliquem qui, the subjunctive is the only mode I find. Aliquis like alius is indefinite so the subjunctive is to be expected.

Habeo aliquem qui.

1.- Pater expectat aut me aut aliquem nuntium qui huc ad se veniat, Cap. 383.

2.- Haben tu amicum aut familiarem quempiam quoi pectus sapiat ? Trin. 90.

3.- Neque domi neque in urbe invenio quemquam qui illum viderit, Am. 1010.

The first clause is probably an Anticipatory Subjunctive. The others are plainly Characterizing. The following clauses resemble those above but their position is such that no conclusions can be drawn from them.

1.-Ne suo gnato crederem neu quoquam unde ad eum id posset permanescere, Trin. 153. (Informal indirect discourse).

2.-Ne penetrarem me usquam ubi esset damni conciliabulum, Trin. 313 (Informal indirect discourse or Ideal Certainty).

3.- Dum ne quid perconteris quod mi haud lubeat proloqui, Aul. 209 (Ideal Certainty).

4.-Ne quid quod illi doleat dixeris, Cist. 110 (Ideal Certainty)

This next clause belongs in this group but the mode of the verb is not certain. Lindsay reads habeat without giving other manuscript readings. Ritschel reads habet and does not give habeat as a manuscript reading at all, though he does give habet.

I.- Nec potis quicquam commemorari quod plus salis  
plusque leporis habet, Cas. 218.

There are clauses which are found with invenio, nanciscor, reperire, etc. which seem to be characterizing. Most of them, however, are merely purpose clauses. I shall give the full list of examples marking those I consider purpose.

- I.- Si quem reperire posset qui mutet suom, Cap.28  
(Purpose).
- 2.- Si queat aliquem invenire qui mutet suom filium,  
Cap.101 (purpose).
- 3.- Tu enim repertus Philocratem qui superes veriverbio,  
Cap. 568 (Purpose).
- 4.- Tu inventu's vera vanitudine qui convincas, Cap.569.  
(Purpose).
- 5.- Nescioquem ad portum nactus es ubi cenes? Cap.837  
(Purpose).
- 6.- Aliam posthae invenito quam habeas frustrari, Men.  
695 (Purpose).
- 7.- Si quem reperire possit quoui os sublinat, Trin.558  
(Purpose).
- 8.- Hoc habet: repperi qui senem ducerem, quo dolo a me  
dolorem pellerem, Most. 715 (Purpose).
- 9.- Thensaurum ut hic reperiret quo illam facilis nuptum  
daret, Aul. 27 (Purpose).

- IO.- Non invenies alterum lepidiorem nec magis qui amico amicus sit, M.G. 560.
- II.- Ecquam tu potis reperire forma lepida mulierem, quoi facetiarum cor corpusque sit plenum et doli, M.G. 783.
- I2.- Nullumne nactus qui possit tibi imperare exercitum, Cap. I54 (= nullus est qui).

Only the last three seem to be characterizing at all. The others have definite antecedents and are plainly purpose clauses. The expression of a state of affairs by such verbs must have been followed by the subjunctive through analogy with the purpose clause. If it were at all common would it not be possible that this construction was a force in bringing about the use of the subjunctive in affirmative clauses of existence?

Two clauses appear after video which seem to be characterizing. The first seems to be equivalent to a sunt qui clause. The other is not that exactly but seems to be an Essential Descriptive clause. It may be a sort of informal indirect discourse.

- I.- Vidi ego multa saepe picta quae Acherunti fierent cruciamenta, Cap. 998.
- 2.- Dic mi, en umquam tu vidisti tabulam pictam in pariete ubi aquila Catamitum raperet, Men. I44.

Outside the clauses given thus far, there is a miscellaneous group where the introductory phrase is not expressly

stated. These clauses occur with both the subjunctive and indicative.

### Subjunctive

- 1.- Nisi meliorem adferet quae me placeat condicio magis, Cap. 180.
- 2.- (Answering the question "Is he rich") Unde excoquat sebum senex, Cap. 281 (Ideal Certainty).
- 3.- Garriet quoi neque umquam neque caput compareat, Cap. 614.
- 4.- Amor amara dat tamen satis quod aegre sit, Trin. 259.
- 5.- Quia cum frugi hominibus ibi bibisti qui ab alieno facile colliberent manus, Trin. 1019 (Ideal Certainty or Informal indirect discourse).
- 6.- Conclude in festram unde auscultare posses quom ego illam ausculem, Cas. 133.

Number 4 is not easily classified but seems to belong here better than in any other place. The following clause has the Indefinite Second Person Subjunctive, so cannot be counted on either side.

Insuperata accidunt magis saepe quam quae speres, Most. 197.

In the *Caterva* of the *Captivi* occurs an example with huius modi, the only one I have found. This part of the play is supposed to have been written in the time of the Empire, so it cannot be used as evidence here.

Huius modi paucas poetae reperimnt comoedias ubi boni meliores fiant, Cap. 1033.

One example with quod occurs where the meaning seems to be non fuit tempus.

Melius anno hoc mihi non fuit domi nec quod una esca me iuverit magis, Most. 691.

It is clauses of the sort given above which cause trouble in making a definition. Some of the clauses seem more closely related to the clauses with tam, etc. Others seem to be descendents of the expressions of existence and non-existence. In Plautus, many of this class of clauses occur with the indicative where the subjunctive would be used in Classical Latin. Those which I have found are,

1.- Sed istest ager profecto malos in quem omnes publice mitti decet, Trin. 597.

2.- Si in aedem ad cenam veneris adposita cena sit popularem quam vocant, Trin. 470.

3.- Ubi facillume spectator mulier quae ingeniosus bono? Stich. 116

4.- Heus senex quid tu percontare ad te quae nihil attinent, Most. 940.

In this miscellaneous division it seems well to mention a set of clauses often called Characterizing. These are the clauses with idoneus, dignus, etc. Hale in his grammar has a force of the subjunctive called Obligation or Propriety and under that places clauses of this type. If this force is not recognized, the best explanation seems to be that they are



volitive. These are the clauses I have found.

- 1.- Videreturne obsecro hercle idoneus danista qui sit,  
Most. 623.
- 2.- Video ted arbitrari me hominem idoneum quem seneta  
aetate ludos facias,Aul. 253.
- 3.- Ob istuc unum verbum dignu's deciens qui furcam  
feras, Cist. 248.
- 4.- Deus dignior fuit quisquam homo qui esset,M.G.1043.

The following clause,while not of this precise type,  
seems to fit this classification better than any other.

Quod manu non queunt tangere tantum fas habent quo manus  
abstineant, Trin. 290.

I have one instance of this construction with ut.

Quia enim non sum dignus prae te ut figam palum in parie-  
tem, M.G. 1140.

These are the figures for the foregoing clauses. All  
clauses depending upon another subjunctive or an infinitive  
will be counted under attraction since they cannot be used as  
a proof because of their position.

	Indicative	Subjunctive	Attraction
Tam,talis---qui		6	I
Nullus est qui		17	I
Quis est qui		10	
Si quis est qui		4	I
Sunt qui	12	5	
Multi sunt qui	3	1	I
Pauci sunt qui			I
Quidam sunt qui	6		
Alii sunt qui	1	3	
Habeo Aliquem qui		3	4

	Indicative	Subjunctive Attraction
Invenio aliquem qui		3
Vidi aliquem qui		2
Miscellaneous	4	12

In its general outlines Hale's theory is borne out by these examples. They began in a Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty. Where this Ideal Certainty began, we cannot explain; that force of the subjunctive had its origin far back of the written language. From this Ideal Certainty, there grew a subjunctive which stated a fact. Hale calls it Actuality. This Subjunctive of Actuality appears in characterizing clauses and in result clauses. In the characterizing clause he says-I believe it is true- that the change from Ideal Certainty to Actuality took place in clauses after a negative antecedent. This happened because<sup>in</sup> clauses like this, "There is no one who would help you", and "There is no one who does help you", the meaning is exactly the same although the form of expression is slightly different. In the affirmative clauses, the difference in meaning is felt. The fact that the Subjunctive of Actuality did in part grow out of the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty is shown by this fact- there are many clauses which can have either interpretations. In my examples I have 18 which I should call Ideal Certainty, 10 which admit of either interpretation and 25 which seem to be nothing but Actuality - 12 of these are in the Nullus est

qui clause where Hale says Actuality got its first start. This number which cannot be classed as distinctly Ideal Certainty or distinctly Actuality are the clauses which give us a clue to the origin of the Subjunctive of Actuality. They are our only excuse for even considering Actuality an outgrowth of Ideal Certainty.

This classification of clauses according to the meaning of the subjunctive reveals several clauses which can be classed as Ideal Certainty or actuality but which have also an Anticipatory or Volitive force. There are two or three in which this force is uppermost and all efforts to classify under Actuality or Ideal Certainty seem futile. In his Cum-constructions, Hale does not call attention to these other forces of the subjunctive but in his grammar he implies something of the sort by calling the Subjunctive of Actuality the result of "Fusion".

Let us now examine the examples with this in view. There are 5 clauses where the subjunctive clause depends on a future verb. These would naturally have a future meaning and fall under what Hale now calls Anticipatory Subjunctive. Another clause depends on expecto which Hale would call an Anticipatory Subjunctive. One clause depends on a Volitive Subjunctive when the subjunctive seems to have no volitive force but merely a future idea. It is a tam---qui clause so there cannot

be the explanation that it is merely attraction. One clause depends on a subjunctive in a Future Less-vivid condition where the Anticipatory may be expected. The clause is of a type which would be subjunctive in any position so attraction cannot be used against it. In two clauses the Anticipatory is a perfectly reasonable meaning and gives better sense for the passage than Ideal Certainty would. All these clauses with the exception of one occur in clauses outside the expressions of existence and non-existence. In those clauses the feeling seems to have been primarily Ideal Certainty. This is natural because we more often say "There are people who would" than "There are people who will", although this latter is, of course, possible. It really seems that the Anticipatory had some influence in bringing in the subjunctive in characterizing clauses particularly those which have no formal introductory phrase.

The Volitive has already been mentioned in connection with the clauses after invenio, etc. It seems to be present in a few other examples, at least that interpretation seems possible. It is in the is(such) that it shows itself most plainly. The clauses after qualitative is in Plautus are usually Volitive clauses, not pure Characterizing ones. It seems to me very probable that this force was sometimes carried over into the purely Characterizing clause. Perhaps the Volitive Subjunctive helped it develop this qualitative

meaning.

It seems, then, that the Ideal Certainty with some help from the Anticipatory and the Volitive caused the use of the subjunctive in characterizing clauses.

Next let us consider the qui-causal clauses which are often considered a part of the characterizing clause. The following are the examples of the consecutive-causal (insanus es qui) type of sentence, also the indicatives resembling these and the other causal clauses which developed, according to Hale, from the first type.

Qui-causal - Subjunctive.

- 1.- Quod te urget scelus, qui hiuc sis molestus ? Men. 323.
- 2.- Quid tibi mecum rei, qui male dicas homini hic ignoto sciens ? Men. 495.
- 3.- Sed ego sum insipientior, qui rebus curem publicis, Trin. 1057.
- 4.- Satin tu's sanus mentis aut animi tui qui condicionem hanc repudies ? Trin. 455.
- 5.- Sed ego insipientior qui egomet unde redeam huc rogitem Trin. 937.
- 6.- Sanus es qui istuc exoptes aut neges te umquam pedem in eas aedis intulisse, Men. 818.
- 7.- Quis homo est me insipientior qui ipse egomet ubi sim quaeritem, Trin. 929.
- 8.- Ne tu me edepol arbitrare beluam qui non novisse possim quicum aetatem exegerim, Trin. 953.
- 9.- Tu male facis, quae insontem insimules, Men. 805.

- 10.- Sed ego inscitus sum qui ero me postulemoderari,  
Men. 443.
- 11.- Certo haec mulier aut insana aut ebriast qui homi-  
nem compellet, Men. 874 .
- 12.- Tu certo non senu's satis, qui nunc ipse make di-  
cas tibi, Men. 315.
- 13.- Sc--- Inscita ecaster tu quidem es Pon--quapropter?  
Sc--- Quae istuc eures ut te elle amet, Most. 208.
- 14.- Stulta's plane, quae illum tibi aeternum putes fore  
amicum, Most. 195.
- 15.- Immo stulta multum quae nobiscum fabulem, M.G. 444.
- 16.-, Ego stulta et mora multum quae cum hoc insano fabuler,  
M.G. 371.
- 17.- Sanus tu non es qui furem me voces, Aul. 769.
- 18.- Nisi forte factu's praefectus novos, qui res alienas  
procurres, Most. 942.
- 19.- Tu ecaster erras, quae illum unum expectes, Most. 188.
- 20.- Qui me alter est audacior homo aut qui confidentior  
inventutis mores qui sciam, Am. 154.
- 21.- ---qui hoc noctis solus ambulem, Am. 154.
- 22.- Tibi Juppiter dique omnes irati certo sunt qui sic  
frangas fores ? Am. 1022.

23-24.- Non sum scitior quae has rogem aut quae fatigem, Cist. 68

Apparently like the other type but in the indicative.

- 1.- Nam insanum esse te scio qui mihi molestus's, Men. 293.
- 2.- Summe ego mulier misera quae illaec audio? Men. 852.
- 3.- Insanit hic quidem qui ipse male dicit sibi, Men. 309
- 4.- Sana tibi mens est aut adeo isti quae molestast  
mihi, Men. 827.

- 5.- Sed ego stultus sum, qui illius dico, Men. 904.
- 6.- Sed ego, summe infelix qui non curro domum ? Most. 362.
- 7.- Ne ego infelix homo fui, qui non alas intervelli,  
Am. 326.
- 8.- Stulte feci qui hunc amisi, M.G. 1376.

The following are the remaining causal qui-clauses in the subjunctive. Those where the subjunctive can be accounted for by attraction or indirect discourse will be marked so.

- 1.- Ne hercle operae pretium quidemst mihi te narrare tuas qui virtutes sciam, M.G. 32 (attraction).
- 2.- Amant te omnes mulieres neque iniuria qui sistam pulcer, M.G. 59.
- 3.- Dadum edepol planumst id quidem quae hic fuerit intus M.G. 406.
- 4.- Quae te intemperiae tenent qui me perperam perplexo nomine appelles? M.G. 435.
- 5.- Eos omnis tametsi hercle haud indignos indico; qui multum miseri sint, Stich. 206 (indirect discourse).
- 6.- Hercules qui deus non sis sane dicessisti non bene, Stich. 392.
- 7.- Pro di immortales similiorum mulierem magisque eandem ut pote quae non sit eadem non reor deos facere posse, M.G. 534.
- 8.- Satuist me queri illo modo servititem qui hodie fuerim liber, Am. 177 (attraction).
- 9.- Quid ego ni negem qui egomet siem? Am. 434. (attraction)
- 10.- Te ut deledam contra, lusorem meum, qui nunc primum te advenisse dicas ? Am. 695.
- 11.- --- qui hinc abieris? Am. 695 (attraction).



- 12.- At pol qui certa res hanc obiugarest quae med hodie adven-  
ientem domum noluerit salutare, Am. 706 (attraction).
- 13.- Sed ego stultior quasi nesciam vos velle qui divos siem,  
Am. 57 (attraction).
- 14.- S.- Tu negas med esse ? M - Quid ego ni negem qui egomet  
siem ? Am. 434 (attraction).
- 15.- Suspiciost eam esse ut pote quam numquam viderim, Cist. 317.  
(attraction).
- 16-17.- Dummodo eam desquae sit quae estuosa quae alat corpus corpore  
sapiat pectus, M.G. 785 (attracted).
- 18.- Tun te expuriges, qui facinus tantum tamque indignum  
feceris, M.G. 498 (attraction).
- 19.- Quid ppust qui sic sim mortuos tamen, Cas. 428.
- 20.- Qui mean ancillulam ingratus postulat quae mihist quae  
meo educta sumptur siet, Cas. 194.
- 21.- Egone ut auderem internuntius ad te qui ingenuis satis  
respondere nequeas, M.G. 963 (attraction).
- 22.- Vah, delicatu's, quae te tamquam oculos amet, M.G. 984.

In Cistellaria 237 ff. there is a series of questions with answers in the relative subjunctive clause which seem to be causal. They are too long to put in here and their form is such that they cannot be used as evidence.

Hale's theory that the subjunctive qui-causal clauses grew out of the consecutive clauses where qui alone is consecutive, without tam or some other word in the main clause, is on the whole the most satisfactory explanation and one which seems to be borne out by the examples just given. We feel both the consecutive and the causal idea in most of the subjunctive con-

secutive-causal clauses. We cannot be sure what Plautus felt. The consecutive was not the only idea because as long as the clause was Ideal Certainty the causal idea could not come in very fast. An expression of Ideal Certainty is not usually used as the ground for a statement. The fact that a man would commit murder, if he had a chance, is not generally used as a reason for saying that he is mad. The first is, I believe, a possible but not a usual form of statement. Therefore, the causal idea in these consecutive clauses would not be very strong until the Subjunctive of Ideal Certainty had, in this as in other consecutive clauses, acquired the ability to state an actual fact. This change in all the consecutive clauses took place before Plautus' time.

On the other hand, the causal idea could not have entirely usurped the Ideal Certainty and have become the primary or only meaning because, then, the tendency to put all causal clauses in the subjunctive would have been much greater than it was. We must say then that Plautus probably felt that the subjunctive was a sort of idiomatic expression after a certain stereotyped introductory word. The fact that he considered it at least a little different from the ordinary causal clause will be shown by these figures from the six plays which I read for all the relative clauses. There are 78 indicative Parenthetical

clauses, which I should call causal clauses although I admit that no two people would classify them exactly alike. There are 13 subjunctive, all but 3 of these can be accounted for by attraction. Of the insanus es qui type, there are in these six plays 17 examples while of indicative clauses resembling these there are only 7.

Bennett says the insanus es qui clause is not always subjunctive. Hale says the same thing and adds that the proportion nevertheless is not the same as that of the regular causal clause. The figures given above seem to bear this out. The figures for the examples given in this paper (taken from ten plays) are,

Insanus es qui, 24

Resembling insanus es qui, but in the indicative, 8

Other causal in the subjunctive, 22, of which 15 can be accounted for by attraction or indirect discourse.

This leaves 7 pure causal clauses as opposed to 24 of the consecutive causal type.

Ut clauses with the consecutive idea after insanus es qui are not found at all. This is another place where qui does not equal ut is. Of course, it may be argued that these clauses are not purely consecutive since they have a causal idea, still it seems that some of them are and then it is plain that qui is, in some kinds of consecutive clauses in Plautus, the only

introductory word.

During this discussion so far no mention has been made of (non) habet quod det, the nulla causast quin or the quod sciam clauses. Hale says that the first two kinds of clauses are Potential Subjunctives and Subjunctives of Obligation and Propriety respectively. They are merely these forces employed in hypotaxis. Some grammars do not recognize a separate force and place them among the characterizing clauses.

An explanation of these clauses along entirely different lines has been given by Tenney Frank in Classical Philology, Vol.II, No. 2 and Vol.III, No.I. He begins by drawing attention to these facts about the (non) habet quod det sentence. They are always subjunctive (this can be accounted for by the Potential); they always express a possibility or capacity not a fact (this can also be accounted for by the Potential) and the relative which introduces the clause is almost always the direct one of momentary and physical action like edo, poto, do, etc. He then says that such a collocation of words with a potential meaning is unique; it does not occur in any other language - nil est quod edim is, in, itself, a senseless expression. It is only when the idea of capacity is introduced that this clause has any meaning. This idiom is fairly well fixed throughout Latin literature although its place is sometimes taken by

a characterizing clause with possum. After noting these facts about the clause, he gives a complete set of examples from Plautus and Terence. Taking up the independent potential, he shows how it can always be explained as some thing else or else the potential idea is a matter of context, not mode. Having proved to his own satisfaction that there is no independent potential, he then tries to find some other reason for the subjunctive in these clauses. Since the words without the potential idea are meaningless, the clause cannot be characterizing though possibly it may be an extension of this. The clauses seem more nearly related to the purpose clause. The subjunctive in a purpose clause is Volitive but if the Volitive idea is weakened, the secondary meaning of Capacity comes to the surface.

When the verb which expresses the effort or intention which governs the Volitive is made passive this Potential idea is all that remains. Thus da quod edim is purpose but datum est quod edim is a potential subjunctive.

In his explanation of the nulla causast quin clauses, Frank again demolishes the independent subjunctive which has a meaning of Obligation or Propriety. He shows that it is more a matter of context than of the meaning of the mode. He thinks that the clauses of this type with quod are a development of the characterizing clause. The quod changes from the direct

object of the verb to an adverb meaning "why". This took place in clauses after a negative because there a question "why?" can be answered only by an explanation of the propriety, never by a statement of the motive of the action. The difficulty in referring these clauses to an independent subjunctive is that quod never in an independent sentence means "why".

Some of the nulla causa est quin clauses, he explains as an extension of the independent Deliberative, although there is only one example in Plautus with quin to warrant this explanation. In this case nulla causa est is, in the beginning, a sort of defining parataxis.

The clauses with cur are merely the question in hypotaxis. In conclusion he says these clauses following certain stereotyped clauses could not of themselves give rise to a general conception of a meaning of Obligation and Propriety in the mode.

I have found 27 negative and 18 affirmative examples of (non) habet quod det. Of the nulla causa est quin class I have 8 with quod, 5 with quin and 1 with cur.

If we adopt these explanations these clauses would have to be classified in various places. They are really well defined types, whether his explanation is right or not, and as such did not need to be classified among the clauses which cause so much trouble about a definition.



Many grammars classify quod sciam with the characterizing clauses apparently thinking it a direct development of these clauses. In the first place, it is always a non-essential clause. It is the only restrictive clause in Plautus which has the subjunctive. There must then be some other explanation of the subjunctive beside the one that it is a development of the characterizing clause.

This is the explanation given by Hale in the Transactions of the American Philological Association, Vol.22, page 105. The quod sciam clauses in Plautus and Terence number 13 after a negative main clause and 2 after an affirmative main clause. In the first place this restrictive phrase was regularly indicative but owing to the fact that it naturally follows a negative clause while the others follow affirmative clauses, it came to take the subjunctive by analogy with the clauses in the subjunctive after nullus est qui. It became so well established before Plautus' time that the subjunctive was invariable even after an affirmative main clause. I have 8 examples of this clause.

Before attempting a summary of the results of this investigation of the characterizing and qui-causal clauses, it may be well to repeat the three questions propounded in the introduction. How can these clauses be defined? Which have the subjunctive invariably and which have both modes? Why do



the clauses of fact have the subjunctive at all?

It must be plain from the grammar discussions that no satisfactory general definition of all the clauses usually included under the name characterizing has yet been made. From the categories and the examples it must be evident that there are in the clauses usually called "characterizing" two apparently distinct kinds of clauses. It is merely attempting to put a round and a square object in a round hole even to try to define all the clauses in one definition.

So then, Lane's plan must be adopted and the definition of the two kinds of clauses given. In defining the clauses, the question about usage will also be answered.

The clauses usually called "characterizing" consist of two groups:

I.- Relative clauses called consecutive, i.e., clauses following an incomplete descriptive word like talis, or a word of degree like tam always have the subjunctive. In Plautus, such clauses always have qui but in Classical Latin the result clause with ut has made its appearance among these clauses.

II.- Clauses after expressions of existence and non-existence (sunt qui, nemo est qui, quis est qui, etc.) have the subjunctive invariably when the principal clause is negative and usually the subjunctive when the main clause implies a

negative. When the principal clause is affirmative the indicative is the more common mode in Plautus. In later Latin, however, the subjunctive is the prevailing mode.

As for the qui-causal clauses, they are, in Plautus, regularly indicative except when they follow an expression like insanus es qui. In that case they are usually subjunctive.

As far as the origin of the subjunctive in clauses of fact, Hale's theory about the negative antecedent is the one which fits the facts of Plautus' language best, i.e., the subjunctive started as Ideal Certainty after expressions of non-existence. Because of a confusion in meaning after such an antecedent, the subjunctive came to be invariable, from this it spread into affirmative clauses of the same sort. The presence of the indicative in such a clause must, therefore, be treated as a survival of an older form and not an attempt to differentiate in meaning, though this last may, in a few cases, be true. In other clauses the subjunctive is Ideal Certainty, helped probably by the Anticipatory and the Volitive Subjunctives.

Therefore, Hale's definitions, statement of usage and theory all seem to be substantiated by this collection of examples from Plautus.